HUMAN EVENTS

Vol. XIV, No. 42 Saturday, October 19, 1957 Washington, D. C.

Printed in Two Sections

THE LIBRARY
WISCONSIN STATE COLLEGE
RIVER FALLS, WISCONSIN

News Section

EISENHOWER: *Prestige waning* (page 1)

THIRD PARTY: *McClellan for President?* (page 1)

KNOWLAND: *On a new tack* (page 2)

QUEEN ELIZABETH: *British critic* (page 3)

ICBM: *Senator Bridges raps scientists* (page 4)

The Eclipse of Eisenhower: The Soviet "moon" has cast such a shadow over the prestige of the President that a complete reconsideration of his political power is now well under way in the Nation's Capital. Indeed, the obvious decline of Ike's popularity dominates all private discussions of politicos in Washington today and is altering all previous concepts of the party struggle upcoming in both '58 and '60. Few such frank evaluations, however, reach the public prints.

As a matter of fact, the decline had achieved no little momentum before the "Sputnik" entered the political skies. The Presidential handling of the Little Rock crisis has wrought far more damage to Ike's reputation than can be measured in the press. Many old-line Republicans in the North were deeply shocked by the spectacle of Federal troops with their bayonets at the backs of Arkansas school girls. More newspapers in the North reflected this sentiment than were quoted in the presumptively omniscient *New York Times*. Nor was this development purely of a man-in-the-street category.

HUMAN EVENTS has received a reliable report of a meeting of a dozen big industrialists in Chicago last week, all of whom had been "Ike-before-1952" zealots and up until 1957 had resented any criticism of him. Some of them had raised literally millions of dollars for the President's campaigns in '52 and '56. These men — according to our report — without exception severely condemned Eisenhower and asserted that they would give no more money to the GOP National Committee as long as Ike remained in the White House.

Among such powerful elements, the objections to the President seem to fall into four categories, which have developed chronologically, as follows: (1) his $72 billion Budget last winter; (2) his stand on "civil rights" legislation; (3) his handling of the Little Rock affair; (4) his policy which led to the Soviet victory in the satellite race, and his sluggishness in recognizing the danger therefrom.

Not the least factor in the discontent of such top-level persons is the realization that Little Rock has perhaps irreparably damaged the Republican party in the South. A number of wealthy Northern Republicans had contributed much money to drives for building a new GOP in the South; today that work lies in ruins.

But perhaps the biggest casualty in the present "Sputnik" crisis is Ike's standing as a military man. This changed attitude towards the General has been in the making for some time. A HUMAN EVENTS article by the late Richard Stokes, "Eisenhower as a Military Man" (June 22, 1957) — in which the author cut Ike's record as a general down to size — drew an extraordinary response and circulated very widely throughout the country.

As the average man in the street views it (so say appraisers of popular reactions in the Capital) Ike as a military man should have foreseen the importance of missiles and rockets and should have acted in time. Republicans in the Capital ruefully admit that the "Sputnik" has given the Democrats a powerful advantage in the court of public opinion.

Officials of the Republican party have readily admitted to friends in the past few weeks that the White House cannot force the nomination of its favorite in the convention of 1960. At the same time, they further confess that GOP organizations for election of members of Congress have all but formally severed their connection with the White House and the National Committee.

The conclusion drawn in the Capital is difficult to rebut — that it is now an open field for conservatives in the Republican party.

Third Party: Senator John McClellan of Arkansas will be the Presidential candidate of a third party in the 1960 elections — according to Capital political dopesters.

It is known that the Senator, along with many other leaders, is impressed by the grass-roots demand — in the South — for separation of the Southern Democrats from the Northern Democrats. He reportedly believes that a real bolt, much more formidable than that of 1948, will eventually result.

McClellan — according to the politicos — is a "natural." With the exception of Senator Harry Byrd, he is the one Southerner who has achieved nationwide renown (as a result of his Labor Rackets investigation). Byrd, it is believed, would not care to take the helm in such a movement, largely because of his advancing years. McClellan is eight years younger than Byrd.

If the third party does come to pass, it is likely that it will seek to file in many Northern states. In that case, familiarity of many voters north of the Mason-Dixon line with the recent activities of the Senator from Arkansas might result in a sizable vote.

Published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C. • Copyright 1957 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

But before that happens, the very real Southern grass-roots demand will have to be translated into political organization. Because of the many problems involved in any such organization, politicos in Washington are reserved about predictions as to its success. (See "What Could Happen in '60," below.)

Dulles' Punch: The Secretary of State did not "shoot from the hip," October 16, when he backed up Turkey against Russia and by implication warned that the U.S. — in contrast to Truman's Korean War policy — would attack Russia directly in support of our Turkish ally.

The Secretary prepared for this "tough talk" by the following moves:

(1) He got in touch with the Joint Chiefs of Staff and obtained their okay on his warning.

(2) He talked with Senator Mike Mansfield (D.-Mont.), Deputy Democratic leader of the Senate, and got his approval.

(3) In a long conference with Foreign Minister Selwyn Lloyd of Britain (here for the Royal visit), he found the Briton most cooperative and willing to back us up. Lloyd phoned Premier Macmillan in London, who gave his assent after consulting with Hugh Gaitskell (the Labor Opposition Leader).

Then Dulles "let loose." State Department circles say he was "feeling his oats."

Labor Front: This week, persons knowledgeable about labor matters on Capitol Hill report that Rackets Committee Counsel Robert Kennedy is behind the plan for special legislation to restrain the Teamsters Union. HUMAN EVENTS last week reported opinion that the AFL-CIO leaders, fearing general legislation restricting the whole labor movement, were planning to get behind special laws which would apply only to the Teamsters — with whose leaders Reuther and Meany are now undisguisedly at war. Kennedy has been the target of charges that he favors and seeks to protect the CIO ("Democrat") unions, as against the "Republican" Teamsters.

At the same time, White House circles — queried on the proposal to harness the Teamsters alone — show a favorable attitude. It is believed that Secretary of Labor Mitchell — who likes to work with Reuther and Meany — has "sold" the idea to the Palace Guard.

● Significant of the developing struggle over the reform of labor was the fact that Senator Knowland, during his brief visit to Washington last week, spent most of his time studying labor matters. Waving away experts on foreign affairs and diplomatic correspondents (to whom he formerly gave numerous interviews), the Californian devoted many hours to discussing all possible avenues to Federal labor legislation, with experts on that subject. Knowland is reportedly seeking Federal measures which will protect individual union members from the power of the bosses; and these he may introduce at the opening of the next session of Congress in January. He has already come out for a state right-to-work law in California — a stand that has aided him in his campaign for the Governorship of that state.

Capital observers find the California Senator's present absorption with the labor issue significant; he had never before shown any particular interest in labor laws. In this new departure, Knowland is not alone in the Senate. It is rumored that many other Senators will at least make gestures on the issue, if they do not actually introduce legislation to "reform labor."

Supreme Court: This week's action by the Supreme Court — freeing two more Communist leaders convicted under the Smith Act — is viewed as an indication that the High Court intends a "mopping up" operation against America's remaining anti-subversive safeguards. In freeing Reds Claude Lightfoot and Junius Scales — on a motion of self-confessed "error" by Solicitor General J. Lee Rankin — the Court has fed the growing wave of popular indignation against its previous rulings — particularly the *Jencks* (opening FBI files) and "Red Monday" decisions handed down last spring. (The Scales-Lightfoot action was based upon the *Jencks* ruling.)

A measure of the deep concern and growing hostility of the American people toward the Court is seen in the speech of Former Associate Justice Stanley Reed last week in California. Reed was a member of the Court that handed down the May 17, 1954, school-segregation ruling and began the long chain of decisions detrimental to states' rights and eroding America's legal barriers against communism. Because of his membership in that Court, Reed's words are deemed to have especially significant bearing on current discussions over the "law of the land."

"The civil rights decisions of the Supreme Court," Reed said, "have called forth harshly worded criticism. The objections proceed chiefly from those whose judicial philosophy differs from that of the Court majorities, but criticism is one thing the First Amendment does not forbid."

"Fortunately," he added, "wrong decisions are not irremediable. The overruling of constitutional decisions when their error becomes apparent is essential."

What Could Happen In '60: Crystal-gazers in the Capital have been busy speculating on the possible effects of a strong third party movement in 1960. A hypothetical outcome, as projected by well-informed observers, runs as follows:

● With the support of Democrat party machines throughout the eleven Confederate States, a third party could muster 128 Electoral votes. Four segregationist border states (Oklahoma, Maryland, Kentucky and Delaware), with 30 electoral votes between them, could augment that total, or make up possible defections.

● If a third party had 128 Electors pledged to its candidate, the Republicans and Democrats would have

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

only 403 Electoral votes to divide between them. One or the other could roll up a heavy vote without obtaining the necessary majority of 266 votes. One sample table, for example, shows that the GOP could carry all the big-city states — including California, Illinois, Michigan, New York, Ohio and Pennsylvania (presumably as a result of the Administration's "civil rights" stand) — and still fall short through a few defections in midwestern farming states.

● If no Electoral College majority is obtained by any party, third party states will hold a decisive balance of power in the House of Representatives, where each state would have a single vote to cast for one of the three top candidates. A check back into the composition of House delegations in the session following the 1948 elections, for example, shows that if the contest had reached the House the four States' Rights Democrat states would have held a veto power over both major parties. If eleven or more states should choose a third party in 1960, their bargaining position as the "swing" vote in the House would be virtually assured.

Collapse of Titoism: Collectivist or semi-collectivist economies the world over — to the discredit of their left-wing devotees in America — are in a state of imminent collapse. In particular straits, say diplomatic observers, are Russia and Red China, Argentina and Great Britain, India and Yugoslavia (see HUMAN EVENTS for September 28, 1957).

The troubles of Yugoslavia, in particular, are the source of considerable embarrassment to "liberal" elements within the State Department, who have championed the cause of dictator Tito for over a decade.

Although attempts have been made to suppress the fact, emigration from Yugoslavia has begun to assume massive proportions. In the month of August alone, 4000 Yugoslavs slipped illegally into neighboring Austria, where they have been given political asylum.

The Yugoslav Foreign Ministry insistently characterizes these escapees as "economic" rather than "political" refugees — presumably to play down the dictatorial nature of the Tito regime. That the Belgrade government itself should blame economic conditions for the flight of the emigrants, however, is deemed a measure of the economic misery existing there — which the officials would, if they were able, also try to minimize as much as possible.

The continuing exodus brought this admission from "liberal" commentator Roscoe Drummond, in a dispatch from Vienna: "There are those in the West who still occasionally say that it is only Russian communism which is malign as a dictatorship and as an economic system.

"Today in Austria there are thousands of Yugoslav refugees whose very presence here says that communism under whatever name or guise — national or satellite or Soviet — produces economic failure and political hell."

Article-of-the-Week: Orchids to the *Saturday Evening Post*, for its lead article (appearing early this week, at the time of the arrival of Queen Elizabeth) by Malcolm Muggeridge, entitled "Does England Really Need a Queen?" The piece stirred controversy (although the author seems to answer the question in the affirmative) both in the U.K. and the U.S.; for Muggeridge described the monarchy as "a kind of royal soap opera," and reported that some upper-class Britons considered the Queen "dowdy, frumpish and banal" — a judgment with which Washingtonians this week could not agree.

Muggeridge, now a prominent English journalist and TV commentator, served the London *Daily Telegraph* in Washington in the years 1946-7 and was known well and favorably to the staff of HUMAN EVENTS at the time. A dedicated anti-Communist and conservative, Muggeridge (almost alone among British correspondents) told Britons the truth about Henry Wallace, then a very sensational figure on the American scene, and offered England probably the first real understanding interpretation of Senator Taft — then cast (by the "liberal" press) in the role of a sort of isolationist villain. Witty, provocative, learned — Muggeridge was a unique personality in the National Press Club.

In his piece in the *Satevepost*, Muggeridge bluntly records the cost, in pounds sterling, of the British monarchy — and concludes sensibly that it's worth it to the United Kingdom taxpayer. Discreetly, he does not say why.

Washingtonians, however, see the Queen's value as obvious. She manifestly is a great help in keeping the Commonwealth countries sold on imperial trade preference, the yield from which is no small item in the impoverished U.K. budget. Additionally, the international political value of the monarchy is considerable. The East Coast upper-class social and financial set in the U.S. has links with the British aristocracy; no small factor that, among the forces that guided the U.S. into World War II. (Britons would retort, of course, that it was F.D.R. who pressured Chamberlain into the war against Nazi Germany.)

Letter from NELLIE REVELL, one of America's outstanding newspaperwomen: "A kind friend gave me a subscription to HUMAN EVENTS for a birthday present and I have been most grateful. It is always well written, frequently startling and alerting, yet proves to be nonpartisan and fact-finding, and a gift for any one who wants to keep in touch with prevailing conditions."

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTION to HUMAN EVENTS for new subscribers only: 5 weeks $1.
Yearly rate, $10; 6 months, $6; 3 months, $3.
By first class mail, $12 a year; by airmail (including APO and FPO) $14 a year. FOREIGN: by regular mail, $13 a year; airmail, $18.
Allow us 2 weeks to process new subscriptions and changes of address.
Bound Annual Volume with complete index $15. Only 1955 and 1956 Volumes are available.
The Declaration of Independence opens: "When in the course of HUMAN EVENTS . . ."

FRANK C. HANIGHEN, *Editor and Publisher*
JAMES L. WICK, *Executive Publisher*
Contributing Editors: FRANK CHODOROV, M. STANTON EVANS

HUMAN EVENTS, 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C., is a weekly newsletter reporting from Washington on politics, business, labor and taxes. It was founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. Published usually in two sections: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article section. Entered as second class matter at Washington, D. C. Copyright 1957.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

KEEP THE EXPERTS ON "TAP," BUT NOT ON "TOP"

By SENATOR STYLES BRIDGES
Republican of New Hampshire

The only aspect of the recent launching of the Russian satellite which should concern the American people is the fact that, in order to thrust a sphere of this weight into the skies, the Soviets must possess rockets vastly superior to those of the United States. Translated into ballistic missiles this one fact could threaten our national survival. It calls for strong action.

Since World War II we have made the fundamental mistake of allowing many of our scientific programs to be dictated by the wishes and special interests of the scientific hierarchy. *We have allowed the experts to be on "top" and have not kept them on "tap" as they should be.*

Two examples should indicate the nature of the problem. When the development of the hydrogen bomb was under consideration, the scientific General Advisory Committee to the Atomic Energy Commission was asked to analyze the feasibility of such a weapon. Having done so and concluded that a hydrogen device was feasible, this group then left the domain of its special competence and began to debate the moral issues of whether or not such a weapon should be built. This political action delayed our program for many months.

The entire development of a nuclear-propelled submarine — as contrasted with a nuclear-propelled aircraft — was dominated, not by the Soviet threat, but by the desires of a group of peace-minded scientists who wanted to use the reactor of the "Nautilus" as a prototype for a civilian power reactor rather than to work on a weapon, which the aircraft would be.

The sad record of the last ten years, therefore, is that a small, but important and vocal, segment of American science entered the realm of politics, beguiled by the promises of peace and light emanating from the Kremlin.

Time and time again they have been cast in the role of experts in international affairs, military affairs, sociology and economics. Since they are so outstanding in their own fields the public has attached a special glamor to their opinions in areas of human behavior about which they are relatively uninformed. This is not a course of action which the scientists pursued maliciously or with evil design; rather, it was a sincere attempt on their part to discharge what they felt to be their responsibilities of citizenship. Our scientists simply became political.

The only justification for the subsidization of science by the Government, as opposed to the subsidization of art, music, or literature, is that the people of this country expect American science to provide the weapons systems and counter-measures to provide for our Nation's security. Atoms for peace, atomic power, electronic devices to dim auto headlights, color televisions and the like are very desirable goals to be attained, but not at the cost of our freedom. The popular uproar following the appearance of the "Sputnik" should convince us that to some degree we have been put upon by misguided experts who are entirely out of their field.

The decisions to be made are simple political decisions having nothing to do with science. Namely:

1. *Do we wish to allow the Soviets to outstrip us in ballistic missiles or not?* This does not take a Ph.D. to answer.

2. *Can we afford to dissipate our scientific and technical talents on pleasant but nonessential projects while the Reds concentrate on ways to destroy us?* The average truck driver could answer this one.

3. *Having seen the advances of Russian technology carried on in absolute secrecy, can we continue to believe in the false gospel that science, secrecy, and security are irreconcilable?* Some people told us that, if we kept telling everything and the Russians kept telling nothing, someday they would find out something which we would fail to discover. Has that day arrived? Have the Soviet scientists been more effective, or less, because they worked in secrecy and were nonpolitical?

It appears as though the "experts" have had their day and it is time to return to the people the peoples' business. The average American wants to stay ahead of the Soviets in weapons. The only way to do this is to work at it.

It is now up to the President, or — if he does not — to the Congress, to begin to assume the responsibility for the direction of our scientific effort. This is a job for our elected officials and not for our Ph.D's.

The time has come, not to ask our scientists what to do, but to tell them what must be done. The entire history of scientific development indicates that technological breakthroughs are in direct correlation to the amount of time and money expended.

We need a ballistic missiles coordinator. Not a scientist, but an administrator who will be given the job to do and an overriding priority in manpower, material, and money to get the job done. Any programs now in existence or contemplated which interfere with the rapid completion of this task must be curtailed or abolished.

Scientific groups must be organized under the leadership of this administrator and all different approaches to the solution of the problems must be pursued simultaneously, as was done in the case of the atomic bomb. In this way we can compress the normal progress of years into months. Political partisanship has no place in this program. Money is no object when national security is at stake, though it must be fairly stated that if many projects now dissipating our effort were abolished the balance sheet would be on the plus side.

The type of program which I am suggesting is not a regimentation of American science. It is merely a demand — which will be answered enthusiastically by our physicists, chemists, and engineers — that in our country's obvious hour of need they lay aside their preferable pursuits and produce the necessary instruments to protect us all. This is nothing more or less than other vast segments of our society are called upon to do constantly.

This, therefore, is the greatest political decision of our time. Are we going to continue to allow "experts" to stay on "top," or are we going to insist that their specialized talents be "tapped" by the people of the United States, so that this country will survive?

Styles Bridges is the ranking Republican in the United States Senate. He is Chairman of the Republican Policy Committee, ranking Republican member of the Senate Appropriations and Armed Services Committees, and former President Pro Tem of the Senate.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Vol. XIV, No. 42 HUMAN EVENTS October 19, 1957

Article Section *Printed in Two Sections*

THE INCOME TAX IS MAKING US A DISHONEST PEOPLE

Will We Repeat the Mistakes of France?

THE LIBRARY WISCONSIN STATE COLLEGE RIVER FALLS, WISCONSIN

By J. Bracken Lee

Former Governor of Utah

Among modern Western nations, France has become a symbol of instability, insolvency and corruption. An analysis of the troubles that beset this once-proud land should serve as a warning to all Americans: for it demonstrates clearly that the United States is going down the same road that France has travelled.

From their earliest years, the French people learn that they must be dishonest in dealing with government. The government is dishonest; in self-protection the citizens must be dishonest. As a result, cynicism and acceptance of governmental paralysis have become important elements in the French way of life.

Underlying this dishonesty is the key fact of French politics: French "statesmen" are experts at promising something for nothing. They were pioneers in the fertile field of expanding "social security" — regardless of economic or moral consequences. As just one of hundreds of examples that could be cited: the nationalized system of railroads retires workers at 50 — so that today pensions are a greater item of cost to the railroads than wages.

When the government converts vast numbers of people still in the prime of life into nonproducers who must be supported by those who are still working, the result is to hold down the standard of living. As a futile means of protest, 30 per cent of the French people vote Communist.

A political system based on the mass bribery of large voting blocs has two obvious results: debasement of the currency (inflation) and then, when that becomes intolerable, excessive taxation. The popular reaction to continuously corrupt government is that tax evasion becomes general and respectable. Dishonesty becomes the code of ordinary life.

French taxes on small business are so high that it is often said that all the money left for small French shopkeepers to live on is the amount they can save by cheating the tax collector. "Double-entry bookkeeping" in France means keeping one set of books to inform the management, and a second to swindle the government. And once the managers learn the art of such double-dealing, they often add a third set to fool the stockholders.

The French government, a couple years ago, in desperation over budget deficits, put on a drive to compel full payment of taxes. Tax collectors were ordered to inspect the books of all business firms — small as well as large. In response came the famous Poujade tax revolt. Merchants organized neighborhood vigilante squads who resorted to physical violence whenever a tax inspector made his appearance — warning him never to show his face on that street again. The government surrendered.

A French tax collector has made an easy living for himself selling a book called "39 Ways to Cheat the Tax Collector." The French book, which lives up to its title, was openly put on sale in French bookstores.

French tax collectors have other ways of making a fast franc. It is an accepted practice for an agent to phone a taxpayer and say that, for a specified commission, he will get him a tax refund. In some cases, the taxpayer is entitled to a refund, but even in those cases, he will — if he knows what is good for him — pay the commission. In other cases, the collector earns his fee by giving an easy lesson on how to defraud the government.

Is the United States headed for the same kind of demoralization that has afflicted France?

All the evidence points that way. The principal feature of American political life for the last 25 years has been the mammoth expansion of the Federal Government. The inevitable concomitants, Big Spending and Big Taxes, make it possible for Government to become the master, rather than the servant, of the people. The corruption extends even into the White House, for Big Spending gives the President the power to corrupt the electorate.

The Administration of Franklin D. Roosevelt furnishes two early, and flagrant, examples of this developing trend:

Example No. 1: In 1938, Senator Alben Barkley (D.-Ky.), FDR's No. 1 yes man, faced a hard fight for renomination. To defeat Barkley's opponent, Governor Happy Chandler, WPA Administrator Harry Hopkins ordered the thousands of down-and-out families on WPA to sign papers pledging themselves

Published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C. • Copyright 1957 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to go into the Democratic primary (changing their party registration if they were Republicans) and vote for Barkley. They were given campaign buttons and told to wear them or get off WPA. Roosevelt's puppet beat Chandler by just the margin provided by WPA.

From its beginning, the New Deal had seen the vote-getting possibilities of WPA. Aubrey Williams, Hopkins' chief deputy administrator, told a big WPA conference, June 27, 1938: "We've got to stick together. We've got to keep our friends in power." WPA spending was geared to the objective of electing FDR's friends and defeating his enemies.

Though 1936 was far more prosperous than any other depression year after 1931, relief and WPA expenditures soared during the fall months of the Presidential election. The same upcurve occurred in the Congressional-election year of 1938. And despite the billions of dollars of defense orders placed in mid-1940, public relief and WPA expenditures climbed sensationally during the fall months when FDR's drive for a third term reached its climax.*

Example No. 2: In the spring of 1944, FDR's No. 2 yes man, Senator Claude ("Red") Pepper was up for re-election. Pepper's undisguised admiration for Joseph Stalin and his appearances at Communist-sponsored rallies in Madison Square Garden made defeat a probability, especially if he failed to win the first primary and the opposition became consolidated in the run-off.

Pepper came to Roosevelt with the solution. For many years, the people of St. Petersburg and Tampa had wanted to convert the privately owned Gandy toll bridge connecting the two cities into a free bridge. But they did not want it enough to pay the cost themselves.

So just before the primary — in April of 1944 — Senator Pepper was authorized by the White House to announce "that in order to further the war effort," the President would seize the Gandy bridge and abolish the tolls. The U.S. Treasury would provide nearly a million dollars to compensate the bridge proprietor.

Every politician knows that gratitude is something rendered for favors yet to come. To comply with that principle, word was spread through Tampa and St. Petersburg that the communities had better vote for Pepper or the legal procedures, on some pretext or other, might not be completed. Pinellas County (St. Petersburg) is the most conservative part of Florida; up until the toll bridge coup, the opposition had taken for granted that it would provide a huge anti-Pepper vote. Instead the Pepper majority in Pinellas County was almost exactly the majority by which the Senator carried the state.

Ask yourself: were free elections held in Kentucky and Florida?

Big Spending has frequently been used as a weapon against conservatives. A well-known example was the experience of Senator Carter Glass — the staunchly anti-New Deal Senator from Virginia.

Glass was a bitter opponent of Rooseveltian spending — including WPA. Thus, whenever he sponsored an application for a WPA project by a Virginia community, he was subjected to a torrent of abuse by "liberals" in press and Government. "The nerve of the man," they screamed. "He lambastes Big Spending as an evil, then he sneaks around to the back door to get his share."

Asked to explain the alleged inconsistency, Glass replied: "If taxes to pay for Government projects were levied geographically according to the votes for or against by members of Congress, then the 'liberals' would have a right to complain. But once a spending bill that I oppose becomes law, Virginia must pay its share of the costs and Virginia is therefore entitled to its share of the benefits."

To the day of Glass' death, however, Roosevelt Administration lackeys never stopped insinuating that Virginia would get a bigger share of Federal spending if it elected somebody who knew the advantage of playing ball with the New Dealers.

A footnote to the Roosevelt regime was recently appended, during last winter's "battle of the Budget." James Roosevelt was asked how his father would have handled the Congressional revolt against spending. The California Congressman — formerly a White House aide to his father — replied that FDR would have given orders immediately to kill at least one Federal project in the district of each recalcitrant Congressman.

THE INFECTION which Roosevelt planted in the American body politic outlived him. The succeeding Truman Administration showed that it, too, was capable of corruption on a grand scale — and with a few wrinkles of its own. Under Truman, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation ran hogwild. The foundation for its peculiar, if "legal," corruption was a law which paid lip-service to the principle that Government should not compete with private industry. The law provided that the RFC could not make loans which were considered safe enough to be made by banks or other private lending agencies. On the other hand, it could not make loans that were not likely to be repaid.

This situation was tailor-made for unscrupulous bureaucrats and politicians. RFC officials could, and did, turn down almost every application for one or the other of the reasons mentioned above — *unless* the application was supported by the recommendation of a member of Congress.

* Drought relief provided in 1954-55-56 — as just one example — proves that Republican human nature is no different from Democratic human nature. The hay feed provided to farmers in drought-stricken areas cost the Treasury $9.9 million for the Congressional election year of 1954, fell to $100,000 for the non-election year of 1955 and climbed to the new record figure of $18.9 million for the Presidential year of 1956.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The RFC wanted Congressmen to be obligated to the agency as a means of getting bigger appropriations. Agency officials and examiners, by recommending doubtful loans, were also providing handsomely for their own futures; some of them went from the RFC to $50,000-a-year jobs with firms they had aided. Congressmen were equally delighted. Successful borrowers owed them heavy obligations and could be pressured for substantial campaign contributions.

Like the Roosevelt regime, the RFC has now passed into history. But the "unfriendly persuasion" of Big Spending lives on. Consider the case of Senator Warren Magnuson (D.-Wash.), one of the many "liberals" in Congress who know how to use Federal money as a means of asphyxiating conservative opposition.

Magnuson won re-election to the Senate in 1956 by a majority of 248,000 – at the same time that Eisenhower was carrying the state by 81,000. About a million votes were cast. Magnuson won all liberal-labor support, of course, by voting practically 100 per cent in accordance with the dictates of the ADA and the CIO. But how did he get 25 per cent of the Republican vote?

A small Seattle industrialist gives this answer:

"Boeing aircraft is Seattle's one giant industry. The Boeing Corporation itself is a big buyer of parts, supplies, and services from local and regional industries – including mine. Fat pay envelopes for the workers in Boeing and its supplier plants mean the difference between boom and bust to our entire region. We send Maggie to Washington to protect our aircraft industry and he does it better than could any newcomer, no matter how capable. Maggie has an 'in' with the Pentagon (and all the other Federal agencies) because for years, he has fought their battles in the Senate – for appropriations, for pay increases, for other privileges and perquisites. They have but to ask and he obliges. The second and third and fourth echelons of Government – who are more important in the granting of favors than the Cabinet-level officials – love Maggie and he loves them."

Continued the industrialist:

"Now I'll admit that Maggie votes against every principle of government that I hold dear. To me, the most important piece of legislation passed in the last dozen years was the Taft-Hartley law. On Taft-Hartley – just like on all other pieces of labor and social legislation – Maggie is Reuther's Little Boy Blue. But Maggie is only one out of 96 Senators. His vote won't decide its fate. As far as I am concerned, the rest of the Senate will have to save Taft-Hartley. We out here have to depend on Maggie to save Seattle. That may be cynical, but that's the way thousands of other Republicans in the state of Washington besides myself feel about it."

Our national defense certainly ought to be above and beyond political greed. Defense appropriations, however, are getting increasingly extravagant as Pentagon bureaucrats master the delicate art of clubbing Congressmen into submission. Congressman Jamie Whitten of Mississippi recently pointed out that it seems to be the goal of the Pentagon to put military installations in every Congressional District in the United States. The logic of this tactic is simple: when the Defense Department announces an installation, it carefully adds that "the construction of the new project is, of course, dependent upon Congress making the necessary appropriations." The people in the favored district are thus put on notice that their Congressman must: (a) not quibble over the demands of the Defense Department; and (b) get busy and promise enough support to the projects of other Congressmen so that his own will go through.

Such skulduggery, it should be noted, is not considered a deep, dark secret. In topsy-turvy Washington today, it is somehow considered immoral *not* to do such things. The anecdote told by Jimmy Roosevelt, for instance – that FDR would slash a project in the district of each economy-minded Congressman – was brought out for the sole purpose of telling Ike that he should do likewise in this year's Budget struggle. "Liberal" commentators lashed unmercifully at the President for failing to exert all his power to force Republican Congressmen to vote as he wished on foreign aid, the school bill and other New Dealish measures. Some columnists unabashedly urged him to tell members that chances for getting Federal funds disbursed in their districts would depend directly upon obedience to his orders.

Hitler burned down the Reichstag to get rid of the German legislative body. Many "liberals" want the President of the United States to use Federal spending as a torch to burn down the Capitol and destroy the power of Congress.

THERE IS NOW ample proof that the policies that corrupted the French will have the same effects upon us.

Big Spending breeds dishonesty at the governmental level and the Big Taxes which flow from Big Spending breed dishonesty at the level of the ordinary citizen. And, as in France, our growing tax dishonesty is not confined to any income group:

A charwoman may list "Susie" and "Lillie" – who turn out to be her dog and cat – as her "children" so there won't be any withholding tax.

In many cities, maids quit their jobs if employers insist on complying with the law requiring payment of social security taxes on their earnings. They don't want to pay their income tax and they don't want the Government to have proof of their earnings.

Clergymen are convinced that if the churches got all the contributions that church-members report to the Internal Revenue Service, their often meager salaries could easily be trebled.

Some building trades union locals extract from employers an agreement calling for "travel pay" – usually $2 per day – and they require it even for workers living across the street from the construction

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

project. Since travel pay, except under unusual circumstances, is taxable income to the worker, the contractor is bluntly warned not to include these payments in his reports to IRS (Internal Revenue Service). Should he fail to follow union orders, he will get no workers from the union secretary, who under his contract is his only source of workers.

"Moonlighters" — workers with a second job — often use assumed names in the hope that their second income will not be discovered. Others take part-time jobs with the understanding that their wages will be paid in cash.

Taxi-drivers, waiters and bartenders go to union meetings to learn what is the smallest amount of tips that will prevent investigation by IRS.

Some doctors and dentists run up against a mental block when it comes to reporting "cash" collections from patients.

Many a painting contractor wins house-painting orders by promising to invoice the job to the customer's business establishment — for which it would be deductible, instead of to his home — for which it would not be deductible.

Miami Beach Hotel owners urge their customers to set up "branch offices" in Florida so they can "expense" the cost of their Florida vacations. This practice has become such a scandal that IRS has issued special instructions to curb it.

But even when the items are brought to light, the executives or salesmen sometimes can make the deductions stick by insisting that a great deal of business can be attributed to the entertainment of customers in Florida on vacation. To defeat IRS investigation, the cheaters often submit to their home offices lengthy fictitious reports about prospects lavishly entertained.

The picture presented by our present behavior is a grim one. However, we have not yet fallen to the degraded level of the French. There is still time, if we make a determined effort, to avoid that fate.

We must begin by understanding a fundamental principle: the success of the American form of government has not — as is often believed — been entirely due to popular voting, representative government and our system of checks and balances. These ingredients are each important; but we should recognize that the basic element is *limited* government. And limited government is possible only when there is a constitutional, inviolable limitation upon the amount of money the Government can take from the people.*

The necessary task, therefore, of those who would restore our national integrity is to curtail the presently unlimited taxing and spending powers conferred on the Federal Government by the Sixteenth Amendment.

One proposal for accomplishing this job is the Reed-Dirksen Amendment, which would limit the Federal income tax to a minimum rate of 25 per cent. A second proposal, the one which I favor, asks for the complete repeal of the income tax. This measure, if enacted into law by the insistence of Americans opposed to national dishonesty, would go far to alter our present course for the better.*

SINCE "honesty" is the theme of this article, it would seem fitting to close with an appeal to clergymen and teachers — the two professional groups entrusted with shepherding our society along the paths of morality. They, above all others, should know that honesty is indivisible: that, in raising children, you cannot teach them to be honest in some matters and dishonest in others.

But strangely, the clergy and the teaching profession have become leaders in the drive to promote Big Government, Big Spending and Big Taxes. Many of these crusaders would change their minds if they could spend a few weeks among the moral ruins of France, studying the final effects of the welfare state.

The greatest good that man can accomplish is to have some part in raising the moral standards of the people. The outright repeal of the Sixteenth Amendment would not only raise the moral standards of Americans, but of the entire world, and would bring a rebirth of freedom in the hearts and minds of people everywhere.

* Object the "liberals": "But you don't believe in democracy if you refuse to give the unrestricted right to levy taxes to Congress which is elected by the people." ANSWER: The Bill of Rights withholds from Congress a number of powers beginning with the right to establish a state religion or to abridge freedom of press or of speech. Is it not equally logical to withhold the power of mass bribery and mass corruption from the Congress and the White House?

* If the Federal Government should ever need greater revenues than can be provided by Federal taxes, Congress can be given the power to require the states to make up the deficit — the allocation to be made in proportion to per capita income. Each state would decide how to raise its share, by the method it felt was best. State taxes would be kept down to nonconfiscatory levels by the danger of losing productive citizens to other states.

J. Bracken Lee, former Governor of Utah, is now National Chairman of "For America."

HUMAN EVENTS was founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. It is published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C. and reports from Washington on politics, business, labor and taxes. It is usually published in two parts: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article. $10 per year.

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTIONS, new subscribers only: 5 weeks for $1.

ORDER BLANK

HUMAN EVENTS, 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.

Send me.....reprints of "THE INCOME TAX IS MAKING US A DISHONEST PEOPLE" at $.....

☐ Payment enclosed ☐ Bill me

Additional copies of this 4-page article: single copy 20¢ (coins, not stamps); 10 copies $1; 25 copies $2; 100 copies $5; 500 copies $20; 1,000 copies $30. In 5,000 lots $25 per thousand. News section sold separately — at same rates. Unless otherwise ordered, reprints are sent by fourth-class mail which takes ten days to two weeks for delivery. For first-class mail delivery, add one cent a copy, for airmail, add two cents a copy.

Enter my subscription ☐ 5 weeks for $1 ☐ 1 year for $10

Name.....

Street.....

City.....Zone.....State.....

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED